arXiv:1610.07253v1 [math.GR] 24 Oct 2016

DUAL ORE'S THEOREM FOR DISTRIBUTIVE INTERVALS OF SMALL INDEX

SEBASTIEN PALCOUX

Abstract. This paper proves a dual version of a theorem of Oystein Ore for every distributive interval of finite groups $[H, G]$ of index $|G : H| < 9720$, and for every boolean interval of rank < 7. It has applications to representation theory for every finite group.

1. Introduction

Oystein Ore has proved that a finite group is cyclic if and only if its subgroup lattice is distributive [3]. He has extended one side as follows:

Theorem 1.1 ([3])**.** *Let $[H, G]$ be a distributive interval of finite groups. Then $\exists g \in G$ such that $\langle Hg \rangle = G$.*

We have conjectured the following dual version of this theorem:

Conjecture 1.2. *Let $[H, G]$ be a distributive interval of finite groups. Then $\exists V$ irreducible complex representation of G, with $G_{(V^H)} = H$ (Definition 3.1); this property will be called* ***linearly primitive****.*

The interval $[1, G]$ is linearly primitive if and only if G is linearly primitive (i.e. admits a faithful irreducible complex representation). We will see that Conjecture 1.2 reduces to the boolean case, because a distributive interval is *bottom boolean* (i.e. the interval generated by its atoms is boolean). As application, Conjecture 1.2 leads to a new bridge between combinatorics and representation theory of finite groups:

Definition 1.3. *Let $[H, G]$ be any interval. We define the combinatorial invariant $bb\ell(H, G)$ as the minimal length ℓ for a chain of subgroups*

$$H = H_0 < H_1 < \cdots < H_\ell = G$$

with $[H_i, H_{i+1}]$ bottom boolean. Then, let $bb\ell(G) := bb\ell(1, G)$.

Application 1.4. *Assuming Conjecture 1.2, $bb\ell(G)$ is a non-trivial upper bound for the minimal number of irreducible complex representations of G generating (for $\oplus$ and $\otimes$) the left regular representation.*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20D60, 05E15, 20C15, 06C15.

Key words and phrases. group; representation; lattice; distributive; boolean.

Remark 1.5. *If the normal subgroups of G are also known, note that*

$$cf\ell(G) := min\{bb\ell(H,G) \mid H \text{ core-free}\}$$

is a better upper bound. For more details on the applications, see [1, 4].

This paper is dedicated to prove Conjecture 1.2 for $[H, G]$ boolean of rank < 7, or distributive of index $|G : H| < 9720$. For so, we will use the following new result together with two former results:

Theorem 1.6. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval and L a coatom with $|G : L| = 2$. If $[H, L]$ is linearly primitive, then so is $[H, G]$.*

Theorem 1.7 ([4])**.** *A distributive interval $[H, G]$ with*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{|K_i : H|} \leq 2$$

for $K_1, \ldots, K_n$ the minimal overgroups of H, is linearly primitive.

Theorem 1.8 ([1])**.** *A boolean interval $[H, G]$ with a (below) nonzero dual Euler totient, is linearly primitive.*

$$\hat{\varphi}(H,G) := \sum_{K \in [H,G]} (-1)^{\ell(H,K)} |G : K|$$

Remark 1.9 ([1])**.** *The Euler totient $\varphi(H, G) = \sum (-1)^{\ell(K,G)} |K : H|$ is the number of cosets Hg with $\langle Hg \rangle = G$, so $\varphi > 0$ by Theorem 1.1; but in general $\hat{\varphi} \neq \varphi$. We extend φ to any distributive interval as*

$$\varphi(H, G) = |T : H| \cdot \varphi(T, G)$$

with $[T, G]$ the top interval of $[H, G]$, so that for $n = \prod_i p_i^{n_i}$,

$$\varphi(1, \mathbb{Z}/n) = \prod_i p_i^{n_i - 1} \cdot \prod_i (p_i - 1)$$

which is the usual Euler totient $\varphi(n)$. Idem for $\hat{\varphi}$ and bottom interval.

We will also translate our planar algebraic proof of Theorem 1.7 in the group theoretic framework (one claim excepted).

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries on lattice theory 3
3. A dual version of Ore's theorem 4
4. The proof for small index 7
5. Acknowledgments 15
References 15

2. Preliminaries on lattice theory

Definition 2.1. *A lattice $(L, \wedge, \vee)$ is a partially ordered set (or poset) L in which every two elements a, b have a unique supremum (or join) $a \vee b$ and a unique infimum (or meet) $a \wedge b$.*

Example 2.2. *Let G be a finite group. The set of subgroups $K \subseteq G$ is a lattice, denoted by $\mathcal{L}(G)$, ordered by $\subseteq$, with $K_1 \vee K_2 = \langle K_1, K_2 \rangle$ and $K_1 \wedge K_2 = K_1 \cap K_2$.*

Definition 2.3. *A sublattice of $(L, \wedge, \vee)$ is a subset $L' \subseteq L$ such that $(L', \wedge, \vee)$ is also a lattice. Let $a, b \in L$ with $a \leq b$, then the interval $[a, b]$ is the sublattice $\{c \in L \mid a \leq c \leq b\}$.*

Definition 2.4. *A finite lattice L admits a minimum and a maximum, called $\hat{0}$ and $\hat{1}$.*

Definition 2.5. *An atom is an element $a \in L$ such that*

$$\forall b \in L,\ \hat{0} < b \leq a \Rightarrow a = b.$$

A coatom is an element $c \in L$ such that

$$\forall b \in L,\ c \leq b < \hat{1} \Rightarrow b = c.$$

Definition 2.6. *The top interval of a finite lattice L is the interval $[t, \hat{1}]$ with t the meet of all the coatoms. The bottom interval is the interval $[\hat{0}, b]$ with b the join of all the atoms.*

Definition 2.7. *The length of a finite lattice L is the greatest length ℓ of a chain $0 < a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_\ell = 1$ with $a_i \in L$.*

Definition 2.8. *A lattice $(L, \wedge, \vee)$ is distributive if $\forall a, b, c \in L$:*

$$a \vee (b \wedge c) = (a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c)$$

(or equivalently, $\forall a, b, c \in L,\ a \wedge (b \vee c) = (a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c)$).

Lemma 2.9. *The reverse lattice and the sublattices of a distributive lattice are also distributive. Idem for concatenation and direct product.*

Definition 2.10. *A distributive lattice is called boolean if any element b admits a unique complement $b^{\complement}$ (i.e. $b \wedge b^{\complement} = \hat{0}$ and $b \vee b^{\complement} = \hat{1}$).*

Example 2.11. *The subset lattice of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, for union and intersection, is called the boolean lattice B_n of rank n (see B_3 below).*



Remark 2.12. *Any finite boolean lattice is isomorphic to some B_n.*

Theorem 2.13 (Birkhoff's representation theorem or FTFDL [5])**.** *Any finite distributive lattice embeds into a finite boolean lattice.*

Corollary 2.14. *The top and bottom intervals of a distributive lattice are boolean.*

Proof. See [5, items a-i p254-255], together with Lemma 2.9. □

3. A dual version of Ore's theorem

In this section, we will state the dual version of Ore's theorem, and prove it for any boolean interval of rank ≤ 4, after Theorem 1.7 proof.

Definition 3.1. *Let W be a representation of a group G, K a subgroup of G, and X a subspace of W. We define the fixed-point subspace*

$$W^K := \{w \in W \mid kw = w \ , \forall k \in K\}$$

and the pointwise stabilizer subgroup

$$G_{(X)} := \{g \in G \mid gx = x \ , \forall x \in X\}$$

Lemma 3.2. [1, Section 3.2] *Let G be a finite group, H, K two subgroups, V a complex representation of G and X, Y two subspaces. Then*

1. $H \subseteq K \Rightarrow V^K \subseteq V^H$
2. $X \subseteq Y \Rightarrow G_{(Y)} \subseteq G_{(X)}$
3. $V^{H \vee K} = V^H \cap V^K$
4. $H \subseteq G_{(V^H)}$
5. $V^{G_{(V^H)}} = V^H$
6. $[H \subseteq K \text{ and } V^K \subsetneq V^H] \Rightarrow K \not\subseteq G_{(V^H)}$

Lemma 3.3. [1] *Let $V_1, \dots, V_r$ be the irreducible complex representations of a finite group G (up to equivalence), and H a subgroup. Then*

$$|G : H| = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \dim(V_i) \dim(V_i^H).$$

Definition 3.4. *An interval of finite groups $[H, G]$ is called linearly primitive if there is an irreducible complex representation V of G such that $G_{(V^H)} = H$.*

Remark 3.5. *The interval $[1, G]$ is linearly primitive iff G is linearly primitive (i.e. it admits an irreducible faithful complex representation).*

The dual version of Ore's Theorem 1.1 is the following:

Conjecture 3.6. *A distributive interval $[H, G]$ is linearly primitive.*

Lemma 3.7. *A boolean interval $[H, G]$ of rank 1 is linearly primitive.*

Proof. Note that $[H, G]$ is of rank 1 iff H is a maximal subgroup of G. Let V be a non-trivial irreducible complex representation of G with $V^H \neq \emptyset$, by Lemma 3.2 (4), $H \subseteq G_{(V^H)}$. If $G_{(V^H)} = G$ then V must be trivial (by irreducibility), so by maximality $G_{(V^H)} = H$. □

Lemma 3.8. [1, Lemma 3.37] *An interval $[H, G]$ is linearly primitive if its bottom interval $[H, B]$ is so (see Definition 2.6).*

Proposition 3.9. *An interval $[H, G]$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{|K_i : H|} \leq 1$$

with $K_1, \ldots, K_n$ the minimal overgroups of H, is linearly primitive.

Proof. First, by Lemmas 3.7, 3.8, we can assume $n > 1$. By assumption $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|G:H|}{|K_i:H|} \leq |G : H|$, so $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |G : K_i| \leq |G : H|$. Let $V_1, \ldots, V_r$ be the irreducible complex representations of G. By Lemma 3.3

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |G : K_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{r} \dim(V_\alpha) \dim(V_\alpha^{K_i}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{r} \dim(V_\alpha)[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \dim(V_\alpha^{K_i})].$$

If $\forall \alpha$, $\sum_i V_\alpha^{K_i} = V_\alpha^H$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \dim(V_\alpha^{K_i}) \geq \dim(V_\alpha^H),$$

and so $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |G : K_i| \geq |G : H|$, but $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |G : K_i| \leq |G : H|$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |G : K_i| = |G : H|$. So $\forall \alpha$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \dim(V_\alpha^{K_i}) = \dim(V_\alpha^H),$$

but for V_1 trivial, we get that $n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \dim(V_1^{K_i}) = \dim(V_1^H) = 1$, contradiction with $n > 1$.

Else there is α such that $\sum_i V_\alpha^{K_i} \subsetneq V_\alpha^H$, then by Lemma 3.2 (6), $K_i \not\subseteq G_{(V_\alpha^H)}$ $\forall i$, which means that $G_{(V_\alpha^H)} = H$ by minimality. □

Corollary 3.10. *If a subgroup H of G admits at most two minimal overgroups, then $[H, G]$ is linearly primitive. In particular, a boolean interval of rank $n \leq 2$ is linearly primitive.*

Proof. $\sum_i \frac{1}{|K_i:H|} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1$; the result follows by Proposition 3.9. □

We can upgrade Proposition 3.9 in the distributive case as follows:

Theorem 3.11. *A distributive interval $[H, G]$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{|K_i : H|} \leq 2$$

with $K_1, \ldots, K_n$ the minimal overgroups of H, is linearly primitive.

Proof. By Lemma 3.8, Corollaries 2.14 and 3.10, we can assume the interval to be boolean of rank $n > 2$.

If $\exists \alpha$ such that

$$(\star) \qquad \sum_{i,j,i\neq j} V_\alpha^{K_i \vee K_j} \subsetneq V_\alpha^H$$

then by Lemma 3.2 (6), $\forall i, j$ with $i \neq j$, $K_i \vee K_j \not\subseteq G_{(V_\alpha^H)}$. If $G_{(V_\alpha^H)} = H$ then ok, else by the boolean structure and minimality $\exists i$ such that $G_{(V_\alpha^H)} = K_i$. Now $L_i := K_i^{\complement}$ (see Definition 2.10) is a maximal subgroup of G, so by Lemma 3.7, there is β such that $G_{(V_\beta^{L_i})} = L_i$.

Claim: $\exists V_\gamma \leq V_\alpha \otimes V_\beta$ such that $K_i \cap G_{(V_\gamma^H)}, G_{(V_\gamma^H)} \cap L_i \subseteq K_i \cap L_i$.

Proof: See the first part of [4, Theorem 6.8] proof; it exploits $(\star)$ in a tricky way (we put this reference because we didn't find an argument which avoids the use of planar algebras). ■

By $H \subseteq G_{(V_\gamma^H)}$, distributivity and Claim, we conclude as follows:

$$G_{(V_\gamma^H)} = G_{(V_\gamma^H)} \vee H = G_{(V_\gamma^H)} \vee (K_i \wedge L_i) = (G_{(V_\gamma^H)} \wedge K_i) \vee (G_{(V_\gamma^H)} \wedge L_i)$$
$$\subseteq (K_i \wedge L_i) \vee (K_i \wedge L_i) = H \vee H = H$$

Else, $\forall \alpha$,

$$\sum_{i,j,i\neq j} V_\alpha^{K_i \vee K_j} = V_\alpha^H.$$

$\forall k$, $\forall (i, j)$ with $i \neq j$, $\exists s \in \{i, j\}$ with $s \neq k$, but $V_\alpha^{K_i \vee K_j} \subseteq V_\alpha^{K_s}$, so

$$\sum_{s\neq k} V_\alpha^{K_s} = V_\alpha^H.$$

It follows that $\forall i, \forall \alpha$,

$$\sum_{j\neq i} \dim(V_\alpha^{K_j}) \geq \dim(V_\alpha^H).$$

Now if $\exists\alpha\forall i, V_\alpha^{K_i} \subsetneq V_\alpha^H$ then (by Lemma 3.2 (6) and minimality) $G_{(V_\alpha^H)} = H$. Else $\forall\alpha\exists i, V_\alpha^{K_i} = V_\alpha^H$, but $\sum_{j\neq i}\dim(V_\alpha^{K_j}) \geq \dim(V_\alpha^H)$, so

$$\sum_j \dim(V_\alpha^{K_j}) \geq 2\dim(V_\alpha^H)$$

By using Lemma 3.3 and taking V_1 trivial, we get

$$\sum_i |G:K_i| = \sum_i [\sum_\alpha \dim(V_\alpha)\dim(V_\alpha^{K_i})] = \sum_\alpha \dim(V_\alpha)[\sum_i \dim(V_\alpha^{K_i})]$$

$$\geq n + 2\sum_{\alpha\neq 1}\dim(V_\alpha)\dim(V_\alpha^H) = 2|G:H| + (n-2).$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|K_i:H|} \geq 2 + \frac{n-2}{|G:H|}$$

which contradicts the assumption because $n > 2$. □

Corollary 3.12. *A rank n boolean interval $[H, G]$ with $|K_i : H| \geq n/2$ for any minimal overgroup K_i of H, is linearly primitive. In particular, a boolean interval of rank $n \leq 4$ is linearly primitive.*

Proof. $\sum_i \frac{1}{|K_i:H|} \leq n \times \frac{2}{n} = 2$; the result follows by Theorem 3.11. □

In the next section, we get a proof at any rank $n < 7$.

4. The proof for small index

This section will prove dual Ore's theorem, for any boolean interval of rank < 7, and then for any distributive interval of index $|G : H| < 9720$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval of rank 2 and let K, L the atoms. Then $(|G : K|, |G : L|)$ and $(|K : H|, |L : H|) \neq (2, 2)$.*

Proof. If $|G : K| = |G : L| = 2$, then K and L are normal subgroups of G, and so $H = K \wedge L$ is also normal. So G/H is a group and $[1, G/H] = [H, G]$ as lattices, but a boolean lattice is distributive, so by Ore's theorem, G/H is cyclic; but it has two subgroups of index 2, contradiction. If $|K : H| = |L : H| = 2$, then H is a normal subgroup of K and L, so of $G = H \vee K$, contradiction as above. □

Note the following immediate generalization:

Remark 4.2. *Let $[H, G]$ be boolean of rank 2, with K and L the atoms.*

- *If H is a normal subgroup of K and L, then $|K : H| \neq |L : H|$.*
- *If K and L are normal subgroups of G then $|G : K| \neq |G : L|$.*

Remark 4.3. *Let G be a finite group and H, K two subgroups, then $|H| \cdot |K| = |HK| \cdot |H \cap K|$ (Product Formula). It follows that*

$$|H| \cdot |K| \leq |H \vee K| \cdot |H \wedge K|$$

Corollary 4.4. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval of finite groups and A an atom. Any $K_1, K_2 \in [H, A^{\complement}]$ with $K_1 \subset K_2$ satisfy*

$$|K_1 \vee A : K_1| \leq |K_2 \vee A : K_2|$$

Moreover if $|G : A^{\complement}| = 2$ then $|K \vee A : K| = 2$, $\forall K \in [H, A^{\complement}]$.

Proof. Suppose that $K_1 \subset K_2$. By Remark 4.3,

$$|K_1 \vee A| \cdot |K_2| \leq |(K_1 \vee A) \vee K_2| \cdot |(K_1 \vee A) \wedge K_2|$$

but $K_1 \cap K_2 = K_1$, $K_1 \cup K_2 = K_2$ and $A \wedge K_2 = H$, so by distributivity

$$|K_1 \vee A| \cdot |K_2| \leq |K_2 \vee A| \cdot |K_1|$$

Finally, $A^{\complement} \vee A = G$ and $\forall K \in [H, A^{\complement}]$, $K \subset A^{\complement}$, so if $|G : A^{\complement}| = 2$, then

$$2 \leq |K \vee A : K| \leq |A^{\complement} \vee A : A^{\complement}| = 2,$$

It follows that $|K \vee A : K| = 2$. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $[H, G]$ rank 2 boolean with K, L the atoms. Then*

$$|K : H| = 2 \Leftrightarrow |G : L| = 2.$$

Proof. If $|G : L| = 2$ then $|K : H| = 2$ by Corollary 4.4.
If $|K : H| = 2$ then $H \lhd K$ and $K = H \sqcup H\tau$ with $\tau H = H\tau$ and $(H\tau)^2 = H$, so $H\tau^2 = H$ and $\tau^2 \in H$. Now $L \in (H, G)$ open, then $\tau L\tau^{-1} \in (\tau H\tau^{-1}, \tau G\tau^{-1}) = (H, G)$, so by assumption $\tau L\tau^{-1} \in \{K, L\}$. If $\tau L\tau^{-1} = K$, then $L = \tau^{-1}K\tau = K$, contradiction. So $\tau L\tau^{-1} = L$. Now $H = H\tau^2 \subset L\tau^2$, and $\tau^2 \in H \subset L$, so $L\tau^2 = L$. It follows that $\langle L, \tau\rangle = L \sqcup L\tau$. But by assumption, $G = \langle L, \tau\rangle$, so $|G : L| = 2$. □

Corollary 4.6. *If a boolean interval $[H, G]$ admits a subinterval $[K, L]$ of index 2, then there is an atom A with $L = K \vee A$ and $|G : A^{\complement}| = 2$.*

Proof. Let $[K, L]$ be the edge of index $|L : K| = 2$. By the boolean structure, there is an atom $A \in [H, G]$ such that $L = K \vee A$. Let

$$K = K_1 < K_2 < \cdots < K_r = A^{\complement}$$

be a maximal chain from K to $A^{\complement}$. Let $L_i = K_i \vee A$, then the interval $[K_i, L_{i+1}]$ is boolean of rank 2, now $|L_1 : K_1| = 2$, so by Lemma 4.5

$$2 = |L_1 : K_1| = |L_2 : K_2| = \cdots = |L_r : K_r| = |G : A^{\complement}|.$$

□

Remark 4.7. *Let $[H, G]$ of index $|G : H| = 2$. Then $G = H \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/2$ if $|H|$ is odd, but it's not true in general if $|H|$ even*[1]*.*

The following theorem was pointed out by Derek Holt[2].

Theorem 4.8. *Let G be a finite group, N a normal subgroup of prime index p and π an irreducible complex represenation of N. Exactly one of the following occurs:*

1. *π extends to an irreducible representation of G,*
2. *$\mathrm{Ind}_N^G(\pi)$ is irreducible.*

Proof. It is a corollary of Clifford theory, see [2] Corollary 6.19. □

Theorem 4.9. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval and L a coatom with $|G : L| = 2$. If $[H, L]$ is linearly primitive, then so is $[H, G]$.*

Proof. Let the atom $A := L^{\complement}$. As an immediate corollary of the proofs of Lemma 4.5 and Corollary 4.6, there is $\tau \in A$ such that $\forall K \in [H, L]$, $K\tau = \tau K$ and $\tau^2 \in H \subset K$, so $K \vee A = K \sqcup K\tau$ and $G = L \sqcup L\tau$. By assumption, $[H, L]$ is linearly primitive, which means the existence of an irreducible complex representation V of L such that $L_{(V^H)} = H$.

Assume that π_V extends to an irreducible representation π_{V_+} of G. Note that $G_{(V_+^H)} = H \sqcup S\tau$ with

$$S = \{l \in L \mid \pi_{V_+}(l\tau) \cdot v = v,\ \forall v \in V^H\}$$

If $S = \emptyset$ then $G_{(V_+^H)} = H$, ok. Else $S \neq \emptyset$ and note that

$$\pi_{V_+}(l\tau) \cdot v = v \Leftrightarrow \pi_{V_+}(\tau) \cdot v = \pi_V(l^{-1}) \cdot v$$

but $\pi_{V_+}(\tau)(V^H) \subset V^H$ and $\tau^2 \in H$, so $\forall l_1, l_2 \in S$ and $\forall v \in V^H$,

$$\pi_V(l_1 l_2)^{-1} \cdot v = \pi_{V_+}(\tau^2) \cdot v = v$$

It follows that $S^2 \subset H$. Now, $HS = S$, so $HS^2 = (HS)S = S^2$, which means that S^2 is a disjoint union of H-coset, then $|H|$ divides $|S^2|$, but $S^2 \subset H$ and $S \neq \emptyset$, so $S^2 = H$. Let $s_0 \in S$, then the maps $S \ni s \mapsto s_0 s \in H$ and $H \ni h \mapsto h s_0 \in S$ are injective, so $|S| = |H|$. If $S \neq H$, then $A = H \sqcup H\tau$ and $G_{(V_+^H)} = H \sqcup S\tau$ are two different groups containing H with index 2, contradiction with the boolean structure by Lemma 4.1. So we can assume that $H = S$. Now the extension V_+ is completely characterized by $\pi_{V_+}(\tau)$, and we can make an other irreducible extension V_- characterized by $\pi_{V_-}(\tau) = -\pi_{V_+}(\tau)$. As above, $G_{(V_-^H)} = H \sqcup S'\tau$ with

$$S' = \{l \in L \mid \pi_{V_-}(l\tau) \cdot v = v,\ \forall v \in V^H\}.$$

[1] http://math.stackexchange.com/a/1609599/84284

[2] http://math.stackexchange.com/a/1966655/84284

But $\pi_{V_-}(l\tau) = -\pi_{V_+}(l\tau)$, so

$$S' = \{l \in L \mid \pi_{V_+}(l\tau) \cdot v = -v,\ \forall v \in V^H\}.$$

Then $S \cap S' = \emptyset$, but $S = H$, so $S' \neq H$, contradiction as above.

Next, we can assume that π_V does not extend to an irreducible representation of G. So $\pi_W := \mathrm{Ind}_L^G(\pi_V)$ is irreducible by Theorem 4.8. We need to check that $G_{(W^H)} = H$. We can see W as $V \oplus \tau V$, with

$$\pi_W(l) \cdot (v_1 + \tau v_2) = \pi_V(l) \cdot v_1 + \tau[\pi_V(\tau^{-1} l \tau) \cdot v_2],$$

with $l \in L$, and

$$\pi_W(\tau) \cdot (v_1 + \tau v_2) = \pi_V(\tau^2) \cdot v_2 + \tau v_2$$

Then

$$W^H = \{v_1 + \tau v_2 \in W \mid \pi_V(h) \cdot v_1 = v_1 \text{ and } \pi_V(\tau^{-1} h \tau) \cdot v_2 = v_2, \forall h \in H\}$$

But $\tau^{-1} H \tau = H$, so $W^H = V^H \oplus \tau V^H$. Finally, according to $\pi_W(l)$ and $\pi_W(\tau)$ above, we see that $G_{(W^H)} \subset L$, and then $G_{(W^H)} = H$. □

Remark 4.10. *It seems that we can extend Theorem 4.9, replacing $|G : L| = 2$ by $L \triangleleft G$ (and so $|G : L| = p$ prime), using Theorem 4.8 and Remark 4.2. In the proof, we should have $K \vee A = K \sqcup K\tau \sqcup \cdots \sqcup K\tau^{p-1}$, $\tau^p \in H$, $S^p = H$ and $\pi_{V_-}(\tau) = e^{2\pi i/p}\pi_{V_+}(\tau)$. We didn't check the details because we don't need this extension.*

Corollary 4.11. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval with an atom A satisfying $|A : H| = 2$. If $[H, A^{\mathfrak{C}}]$ is linearly primitive, then so is $[H, G]$.*

Proof. Immediate by Corollary 4.6 and Theorem 4.9. □

One of the main result of the paper is the following:

Theorem 4.12. *A boolean interval $[H, G]$ of rank $n < 7$, is linearly primitive.*

Proof. Let $K_1, \ldots, K_n$ be the atoms of $[H, G]$. By Corollary 4.11, we can assume that $|K_i : H| \neq 2$, $\forall i$. Now $n \leq 6$ and $|K_i : H| \geq 3$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{|K_i : H|} \leq 6 \times \frac{1}{3} = 2.$$

The result follows by Theorem 3.11. □

For the upper bound on the index of distributive interval we will need a former result (proved group theoretically in [1]):

Theorem 4.13. [1, Theorem 3.24] *A boolean interval $[H, G]$ with a (below) nonzero dual Euler totient is linearly primitive.*

$$\hat{\varphi}(H, G) := \sum_{K \in [H,G]} (-1)^{\ell(H,K)} |G : K|$$

with $\ell(H, K)$ the rank of $[H, K]$.

Conjecture 4.14. *A rank n boolean interval has $\hat{\varphi} \geq 2^{n-1}$.*

Remark 4.15. *If Conjecture 4.14 is correct, then its lower bound is optimal, because realized by the interval $[1 \times S_2^n, S_2 \times S_3^n]$.*

Lemma 4.16. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval of rank n and index $\prod p_i^{r_i}$ with p_i prime and $\sum_i r_i = n$. Then for any atom A and any $K \in [H, A^{\complement}]$, $|K \vee A : K| = p_i$ for some i.*

Proof. Let $A_1, \cdots, A_r$ be the atoms of $[H, G]$ such that $K = \bigvee_{i=1}^{r} A_i$, let $A_{r+1} = A$ and $A_{r+2}, \ldots, A_n$ all the other atoms. By considering the corresponding maximal chain we have that

$$|G : H| = |A_1 : H| \cdot |A_1 \vee A_2 : A_1| \cdots |K \vee A : K| \cdots |G : A_{n-1}^{\complement}|$$

It's a product of n numbers > 1 and the result is composed by n prime numbers, so by the fundamental theorem of arithmetic, any component above is prime, then $|K \vee A : K| = p_i$ for some i. □

Lemma 4.17. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval of rank n and index p^n with p prime. Then $\hat{\varphi}(H, G) = (p-1)^n > 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.16, $\hat{\varphi}(H, G) = \sum_k (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} p^k = (p-1)^n$ □

Remark 4.18. *Lemma 4.17 is coherent with Conjecture 4.14 because if $p = 2$ then $n = 1$ by Lemma 4.1.*

Proposition 4.19. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval of rank n and index $p^{n-1}q$, with p, q prime and $p \leq q$. Then*

$$\hat{\varphi}(H, G) = (p-1)^n [1 + \frac{q-p}{p}(1 - \frac{1}{(1-p)^m})] \geq (p-1)^n > 0.$$

with m be the number of coatoms $L \in [H, G]$ with $|G : L| = q$.

Proof. If $m = 0$, then by Lemma 4.16, Corollary 4.4 and $p \leq q$, for any atom $A \in [H, G]$ and $\forall K \in [H, A^{\complement}]$, $|K \vee A : K| = p$, so $|G : H| = p^n$ and $\hat{\varphi}(H, G) = (p-1)^n$ by Lemma 4.17, ok.

Else $m \geq 1$. We will prove the formula by induction. If $n = 1$, then $m = 1$ and $\hat{\varphi}(H, G) = q - 1$, ok. Next, assume it is true at rank $< n$. Let L be a coatom with $|G : L| = q$, then for $A = L^{\complement}$,

$$\hat{\varphi}(H, G) = q\hat{\varphi}(H, L) - \hat{\varphi}(A, G)$$

Now $|L:H|=p^{n-1}$ so by Lemma 4.17, $\hat{\varphi}(H,L)=(p-1)^{n-1}$. But $|A:H|=p$ or q. If $|A:H|=p$ then $|G:A|=p^{n-2}q$ and by induction

$$\hat{\varphi}(A,G)=(p-1)^{n-1}[1+\frac{q-p}{p}(1-\frac{1}{(1-p)^{m-1}})].$$

Else $|A:H|=q$, $|G:A|=p^{n-1}$, $m=1$ and the same formula works. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\varphi}(H,G)&=(p-1)^{n-1}[q-1-\frac{q-p}{p}(1-\frac{1}{(1-p)^{m-1}})]\\&=(p-1)^n[\frac{q-1}{p-1}+\frac{q-p}{p}(\frac{1}{1-p}-\frac{1}{(1-p)^m})]\\&=(p-1)^n[\frac{q-1}{p-1}-\frac{q-p}{p}(1+\frac{1}{p-1})+\frac{q-p}{p}(1-\frac{1}{(1-p)^m})]\\&=(p-1)^n[1+\frac{q-p}{p}(1-\frac{1}{(1-p)^m})]\end{aligned}$$

The result follows. □

Definition 4.20. *A chain $H_1\subset\cdots\subset H_{r+1}$ is of type $(k_1,\dots,k_r)$ if $\exists\sigma\in S_r$ with $k_{\sigma(i)}=|H_{i+1}:H_i|$ (so that we can choose $(k_i)_i$ increasing).*

Remark 4.21. *The proof of Proposition 4.19 is working without assuming p,q prime, but assuming type $(p,\dots,p,q)$ for every maximal chain of $[H,G]$. For p prime and $q=p^2$ we deduce that at rank n and index p^{n+1}, there is $1\leq m\leq n$ such that*

$$\hat{\varphi}(H,G)=(p-1)^{n+1}+(p-1)^n-(-1)^m(p-1)^{n+1-m}\geq(p-1)^{n+1}$$

If there is no edge of index 2, we can also take $q=2p$ or $(p,q)=(3,4)$.

Lemma 4.22. *A boolean interval $[H,G]$ of index $|G:H|=a^nbc$ and rank $n+2$ with $3\leq a\leq b\leq c\leq 12$, $1\leq n\leq 6$ and every maximal chain of type $(a,\dots,a,b,c)$, has a dual Euler totient $\hat{\varphi}(H,G)\geq(a-1)^{n+2}$.*

Proof. This is checked by computer calculation using the following iterative method. Let L be a coatom just that $|G:L|=c$ and $A=L^{\mathfrak{C}}$. Then $\hat{\varphi}(H,G)=c\hat{\varphi}(H,L)-\hat{\varphi}(A,G)$. Now $|L:H|=a^nb$ so we can use Propoposition 4.19 formula for $\hat{\varphi}(H,L)$. Next there are three cases: $|A:H|=a,b$ or c. If $|A:H|=c$ then, by Corollary 4.4, $\forall K\in[H,L]$, $|K\vee A:K|=c$, so $\hat{\varphi}(H,G)=(c-1)\hat{\varphi}(H,L)$. If $|A:H|=b$, then $|G:A|=a^nc$ so we can use Propoposition 4.19 formula for $\hat{\varphi}(A,G)$. Else $|A:H|=a$ and $|G:A|=a^{n-1}bc$, so we iterate the method. □

Remark 4.23. *Let $[H,G]$ be a boolean interval and A an atom such that $\forall K\in[H,A^{\mathfrak{C}}]$, $|K\vee A:K|=|A:H|$. So $\hat{\varphi}(H,A^{\mathfrak{C}})=\hat{\varphi}(A,G)$ and*

$$\hat{\varphi}(H,G)=|A:H|\hat{\varphi}(H,A^{\mathfrak{C}})-\hat{\varphi}(A,G)=(|A:H|-1)\hat{\varphi}(A,G).$$

Corollary 4.24. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval such that for any atom A and $\forall K \in [H, A^{\mathfrak{C}}]$, $|K \vee A : K| = |A : H|$. Then*

$$\hat{\varphi}(H, G) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (|A_i : H| - 1) > 0.$$

with $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ all the atoms of $[H, G]$.

Proof. By Remark 4.23 and induction. □

Lemma 4.25. *Let $[H, G]$ boolean of rank 2 and index < 32. Let K, L be the atoms, $a = |G : K|$, $b = |G : L|$, $c = |L : H|$ and $d = |K : H|$.*



If $a \neq 7$, then $(a, b) = (c, d)$.
If $a = 7$ and $a \neq c$ then $a = b = 7$ and $c = d \in \{3, 4\}$.

Proof. We can check by GAP[3] that there are exactly 241 boolean intervals $[H, G]$ of rank 2 and index $|G : H| < 32$ (up to equivalence). They all satisfy $(a, b) = (c, d)$, except $[D_8, PSL_2(7)]$ and $[S_3, PSL_2(7)]$, for which $(a, b) = (7, 7)$ and $(c, d) = (3, 3)$ or $(4, 4)$. □

Corollary 4.26. *Let $[H, G]$ be a boolean interval having a maximal chain such that the product of the index of two different edges is < 32, and no edge has index 7. Then $[H, G]$ satisfies Corollary 4.24.*

Proof. Consider such a maximal chain

$$H = K_0 \subset K_1 \subset \cdots \subset K_n = G$$

and $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ the atoms of $[H, G]$ such that $K_i = K_{i-1} \vee A_i$. Now, $\forall i$ and $\forall j < i$, $[K_{j-1}, K_j \vee A_i]$ is boolean of rank 2, so by Lemma 4.25,

$$|K_i : K_{i-1}| = |K_{i-2} \vee A_i : K_{i-2}| = |K_{i-3} \vee A_i : K_{i-2}| = \cdots = |A_i : H|$$

Next, $\forall i$ and $\forall j \geq i$, let $L_{j-1} = K_j \wedge A_i^{\mathfrak{C}}$, then $[L_j, K_{j+2}]$ is boolean of rank 2 and by Lemma 4.25,

$$|K_i : K_{i-1}| = |K_{i+1} : L_i| = |K_{i+2} : L_{i+1}| = \cdots = |G : A_i^{\mathfrak{C}}|$$

Finally, by Corollary 4.4, $\forall K \in [H, A_i^{\mathfrak{C}}]$,

$$|A_i : H| \leq |K \vee A_i : K| \leq |G : A_i^{\mathfrak{C}}|$$

but $|A_i : H| = |K_i : K_{i-1}| = |G : A_i^{\mathfrak{C}}|$; the result follows. □

[3]The GAP Group, http://www.gap-system.org, version 4.8.3, 2016.

Remark 4.27. *A combinatorial argument could replace the use of Corollary 4.4 in the proof of Corollary 4.26.*

Remark 4.28. *Here is the list of all the numbers* < 10125 *which are product of at least seven integers* ≥ 3*; first with exactly seven integers:*

$2187 = 3^7$	$4860 = 3^5 4^1 5$	$6480 = 3^4 4^2 5$	$7776 = 3^5 4^1 8$	$8748 = 3^6 12$
$2916 = 3^6 4$	$5103 = 3^6 7$	$6561 = 3^6 9$	$8019 = 3^6 11$	$9072 = 3^4 4^2 7$
$3645 = 3^6 5$	$5184 = 3^4 4^3$	$6804 = 3^5 4^1 7$	$8100 = 3^4 4^1 5^2$	$9216 = 3^2 4^5$
$3888 = 3^5 4^2$	$5832 = 3^6 8$	$6912 = 3^3 4^4$	$8505 = 3^5 5^1 7$	$9477 = 3^6 13$
$4374 = 3^6 6$	$6075 = 3^5 5^2$	$7290 = 3^6 10$	$8640 = 3^3 4^3 5$	$9720 = 3^5 4^1 10$;

next with exactly eight integers: $6561 = 3^8$, $8748 = 3^7 4$*; nothing else.*

We can now prove the main theorem of the paper:

Theorem 4.29. *A distributive interval* $[H, G]$ *of index* $|G : H| < 9720$*, is linearly primitive.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.8, Corollary 2.14 and Theorem 4.12, we can assume the interval to be boolean of rank $n \geq 7$, and without edge of index 2 by Corollary 4.6 and Theorem 4.9. So by Theorem 4.13, it suffices to check that for every index (except 9720) in the list of Remark 4.28, any boolean interval as above with this index has a nonzero dual Euler totient. We can assume the rank to be 7, because at rank 8, the indices 3^8 and $3^7 4$ are checked by Lemma 4.17 and Remark 4.21, and there is nothing else at rank > 8. Now, any maximal chain for such a boolean interval of index $3^5 4^1 5$ has type $(3, \dots, 3, 4, 5)$, so it is checked by Corollary 4.26. Idem for index $3^6 10$ with $(3, \dots, 3, 10)$ or $(3, \dots, 3, 5, 6)$. The index $3^6 7$ is checked by Proposition 4.19. For the index $3^6 12$, if there is a maximal chain of type $(3, \dots, 3, 6, 6)$, $6^2 > 32$ but using Lemma 4.25 with $a, b, c, d \in \{3, 6\}$ we can deduce that $(a, b) = (c, d)$, so the proof of Corollary 4.26 is working; else 12 must appears in every maximal chain, so that the proof of Proposition 4.19 works with $q = 12$. We can do the same for every index, except $3^5 4^1 7$, $3^5 4^1 8$, $3^5 5^1 7$, $3^4 4^2 7$, $3^5 4^1 10$. For index $3^5 4^1 8$, if there is a maximal chain of type $(3, \dots, 3, 4, 4, 6)$, then ok by Corollary 4.26, else (because there is no edge of index 2) every maximal chain is of type $(3, \dots, 3, 4, 8)$, so ok by Lemma 4.22. We can do the same for every remaining index except $3^5 4^1 10 = 9720$, the expected upper bound. □

Remark 4.30. *The tools above don't check* $3^5 4^1 10$ *because the possible maximal chain types are* $(3, \dots, 3, 4, 5, 6)$*,* $(3, \dots, 3, 4, 10)$ *and* $(3, \dots, 3, 5, 8)$*. The first is ok by Corollary 4.26, but not the two last because* $4 \cdot 10 = 5 \cdot 8 = 40 > 32$*. So there is not necessarily a unique maximal chain type, and Lemma 4.22 can't be applied. Nevertheless, more intensive computer investigation can probably leads beyond* 9720*.*

5. Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Derek Holt for showing me a theorem on representation theory used in this paper. This work is supported by the Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Chennai.

References

[1] Mamta Balodi and Sebastien Palcoux, *On boolean intervals of finite groups*, arXiv:1604.06765v5, 25pp. submitted to Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.

[2] I. Martin Isaacs, *Character theory of finite groups*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1994. Corrected reprint of the 1976 original [Academic Press, New York; MR0460423 (57 #417)]. MR1280461

[3] Oystein Ore, *Structures and group theory. II*, Duke Math. J. **4** (1938), no. 2, 247–269, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-38-00419-3. MR1546048

[4] Sebastien Palcoux, *Ore's theorem for cyclic subfactor planar algebras and applications*, arXiv:1505.06649v10, 50pp. submitted to Pacific J. Math.

[5] Richard P. Stanley, *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 49, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. MR2868112

Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Chennai, India
E-mail address: palcoux@imsc.res.in